LOWE INSIGHTS | NASHAY LOWE, PHD | BRIEF | APRIL 2026

There Is No Universal Model: What Global Reconciliation Teaches About Conflict Systems

> Effective responses to conflict are not transferable as fixed models. What proves effective is not the model itself, but how intentionally it is designed to align with the cultural, historical, and relational context it is meant to serve.

Why This Matters

Leaders and organizations routinely search for proven frameworks to resolve conflict, improve communication, and rebuild trust. Yet across global peacebuilding efforts, a consistent and instructive pattern emerges: similar challenges produce different solutions, and approaches that succeed in one context do not necessarily replicate cleanly in another. Cultural values fundamentally shape how harm, accountability, and repair are understood. Systems that ignore context often fail to gain trust or traction—not because the people involved are unwilling, but because the approach itself is misaligned with the environment it is meant to serve.

This is not a theoretical concern. It plays out in organizations every day: a conflict resolution protocol that thrives in one division stalls in another; a communication model celebrated in one industry falls flat when imported without adaptation. What works is not the model itself—it is the fit between the model and the environment in which it operates.

Similar Challenges, Different Solutions

Comparable conflicts across contexts consistently produce distinct, locally-shaped responses rather than uniform outcomes.

Cultural Values Shape Understanding

How harm, accountability, and repair are defined varies significantly across teams, communities, and organizations.

Context-Blind Systems Lose Traction

Frameworks applied without adaptation struggle to earn trust and often stall before producing meaningful results.

What Leaders Often Miss

The most common mistake is treating frameworks as solutions rather than tools. When a conflict strategy is adopted wholesale—without being adapted to the team's culture, history, and power dynamics—it is unlikely to gain genuine engagement. Leaders implement models without adjusting for team dynamics. Conflict strategies are applied uniformly across groups with meaningfully different norms. Cultural and relational differences are overlooked in the name of consistency. And when results fall short, the problem is attributed to the people involved rather than to a misalignment in approach.

This creates a compounding problem: frustration mounts, trust in the process erodes, and leaders often conclude that conflict is simply "difficult to resolve." In reality, the system is misaligned with its context. The conflict may be entirely workable—but the tool being used wasn't designed for this environment.

Pause the Pattern™

Instead of asking: *"What model should we use?"*

Shift to: *"What does this context require to make resolution possible?"*
This shift centers **design over adoption**.

Practical Actions for Leaders

01

Assess Context Before Applying Solutions

Evaluate team culture, history, and power dynamics before selecting any approach. Context is not background—it is the foundation of effective design.

02

Adapt Frameworks, Don't Import Them

Use existing models as guides, not blueprints. Modify them to reflect the specific relational and cultural environment you are working within.

03

Align with Cultural Norms

Consider how shared values shape communication, accountability, and the very concept of repair across your team or organization.

04

Design for Process, Not Just Outcome

Focus on how resolution happens—not only what the end result looks like. The quality of the process shapes whether outcomes are trusted and sustained.

05

Expect Iteration

Effective conflict systems evolve. Build in space for review, adjustment, and refinement as conditions and relationships change over time.

06

Avoid One-Size-Fits-All Thinking

Different teams may require different approaches—even within the same organization. Uniformity can be a barrier to effectiveness.

STRATEGIC TAKEAWAY

Design It Here. For These People. In This Context.

There is no universal blueprint for resolving conflict because conflict does not occur in a vacuum. It is shaped by context, culture, and the specific relationships in play. What proves effective is not the model itself, but how well it is designed to fit the environment in which it operates. Sustainable systems are not adopted as fixed solutions—they are intentionally built and continuously refined to reflect the realities they are meant to serve.

The strategic advantage, then, lies not in finding the right model, but in developing the organizational capacity to design one that works here, in this context, with these people. That capacity—contextual design thinking applied to conflict—is what distinguishes organizations that resolve tension from those that merely manage it.

> "The question is not whether a model works. It is whether it works *here*—within this specific environment, with these dynamics, and in a way that people can engage with, trust, and sustain beyond initial implementation."
> **— Nashay Lowe, PhD**

Closing Reflection

Every system is shaped by the people and conditions within it, carrying the imprint of its history, relationships, and shared experiences over time. What emerges as "effective" is not universal truth—it is alignment between the approach being used and the context it is meant to serve. This is precisely why models that succeed elsewhere often lose traction when applied without adaptation. The framework may be sound. The intentions may be genuine. But without that alignment, even well-designed approaches can feel disconnected, misunderstood, or unsustainable in practice.

Over time, this misfit does more than limit effectiveness—it can erode trust in the process itself. When people experience repeated attempts at resolution that don't quite fit their reality, they stop engaging. They comply without commitment. They wait for the initiative to pass. The erosion is quiet, but consequential. Rebuilding that trust requires more than a better model. It requires a fundamentally different approach to how models are designed and deployed.

The Misalignment Trap

When frameworks are applied without adaptation, organizations experience a predictable pattern: initial adoption, limited traction, declining engagement, and eroded trust in the process itself—reinforcing the false belief that conflict is unresolvable.

The Design Advantage

Organizations that treat conflict systems as designed rather than adopted develop a durable capability: the ability to build approaches that fit their specific people, culture, and moment—and to refine them as conditions evolve.

Pause the Pattern™ — Your Next Step
Choose one place this dynamic exists in your organization. Examine what sustains it. Then take a deliberate step to change it—**by design**, not by default.

If you are navigating this in your organization, you can learn more or schedule a consultation at **Lowe Insights**.
